

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Educational Technology
Thursday, March 13, 2008
36 Gerberding Hall

Chair Kaminsky called the meeting to order at 2:33 p.m.

Meeting Synopsis

1. Approve Agenda
2. Approve Minutes
3. Chair's Announcements
4. Open Announcements
5. Educational Technology Funding
 - a. Roberta Hopkins: Overview/Status Report on Educational Technology Funding
 - b. Anjanette Young: Research Data Archives
6. Old Business
7. News from Catalyst, Libraries
8. New Business

1. Agenda –Approved

2. February 14, 2008 Minutes – Approved

3. Chair's Announcements

- *SEC Meeting: Recommendation for Webcam Policy*
 - Kaminsky reports on the recent Senate Executive Committee meeting, where he presented the text guidelines for UW-Webcams, proposed by FCET. The SEC suggests looking into Class-C legislation for this, to show that UW hasn't neglected the topic. Moy asks where resulting text would be published, and Kaminsky responds that a limited version will likely be included in the Student Handbook.
 - Kaminsky will send the FCET-approved guidelines to the SEC Chair, and will likely appear on an agenda at the end of summer.

4. Open Announcements

- *Subcommittee for Mini-Conference on Plagiarism*
 - Subcommittee is comprised of Martin-Morris, Moy & Efthimiadis. Martin-Morris has contacted, and discussed with, others the possibility of adding a plagiarism mini-conference to the already scheduled Symposium for Teaching & Learning. This mini-conference would not run concurrent to the Symposium, but rather immediately proceeding, or after the currently scheduled events.
 - Martin-Morris reports that CIDR has proven difficult to contact, and the subcommittee is still awaiting a response. Kaminsky also indicates that an ASUW contact would be helpful to the sub-committee. Schmidt recommends Jennifer Hahn, and will send her contact info.
 - Martin-Morris notes that some of the preferred panel participants for the plagiarism mini-conference are already committed to the larger Teaching & Learning symposium, and suggests as an addition, or as an alternative, to the mini-conference, that FCET "host" an informative poster session during the Symposium, as this is free of charge. Moy agrees that this should be done, regardless of whether mini-conference is held. The committee discusses the option, and

considers setting up a poster, as well as opportunities to use some of the various interactive tools that have been discussed by FCET. The committee considers participating in the poster session, and holding a follow-up symposium on a different day.

5. Educational Technology Funding

- *Roberta Hopkins - Overview/Status Report*

- Hopkins, Director of Classroom Support Services (CSS) gives an over view of the services that CSS provides, including A/V, support for podcasting, screencasting, and 'clickers' (audience response systems). She notes that many funding issues are technology-driven, i.e. the need for new laptops, the change from analog to HD televisions, which have in turn also created a need for new projectors and TV's in classrooms. Hopkins explains that CSS funding is 60% state allocations and 40% revenue based (through such services as event spaces, rentals, etc.)
- Clarification and explanation of the "clicker" program are requested. Hopkins gives a brief history of the Audience Response System project, the technologies available, and explains that CSS supports faculty who use clickers within the classroom. Students purchase clickers, in same manner as textbooks, and reuse them for other courses, or sell them back to the bookstore when finished with their course (in similar manner to textbooks). Clickers are registered (and identifiable) to a particular student.
- Hopkins continues that the Technology Consortium, which consists of Health Sciences Academic Services, CSS, Libraries, and Catalyst, works together to determine priorities and to distribute the state funding received among its members. Previously, ATAC requested a funding proposal, as currently there is no biennium funding for technology purchases and upgrading, and all requests and subsequent funding are ad-hoc. Hopkins provided an Excel spreadsheet which shows requests vs. allocations (*attached*). She states that if funding is received, it is almost always a lesser amount than requested. Priority projects are funded first, but a review of all projects and systems is completed and lesser priorities may be given-up or overlooked. As an example, she cites that there will be a 50% drop in available faculty check-out laptops by the end of Spring 2008, due to equipment failure.
- Hopkins shares that the general funding issue is a lack of understanding that a singular investment will not last (or out-last) current technologies and that continued funding is needed to keep up-to-date. Also, technology usage in teaching has increased, but funding has not, and the current funding model is one that is reactive, not proactive. ATAC has disbanded, so currently no one reviews the funding requests. Hopkins would like to see funding become permanent, and any indication in support of that would be appreciated.
- Kaminsky proposes a vote on a motion of written support of funding, and the committee unanimously agrees to pass the following written statement:

The Faculty Council on Educational Technology requests a stable source of financial support for contemporary teaching technology to be made available for the 'Technology Consortium' to innovate teaching capabilities to meet and satisfy student's and faculty's expectations and learning experience as well as sustain the University of Washington's position as a center of teaching excellence.*

** The Teaching Consortium consists of:
Classroom Support Services; Health Sciences Classroom Services; University Libraries; Catalyst*

- Kaminsky will present this statement at the next SEC meeting.

- *Anjanette Young -Research Data Archiving*
 - Young provides an overview of Research Data archiving (available at <http://sites.google.com/a/u.washington.edu/digital-curation/Home>), a subset of digital conservation, which covers data storage and retrieval. She also provides an overview of current projects, including GIS data, the Research Video Archive pilot project, and a recent NSF inclusion to store data for research. Young notes that one problem is getting large data files back to UW [from researchers at conclusion of project] for archival.
 - Young provides an example of well-organized Research Data archiving at Stanford, which stewards the data for 3 years after the conclusion of a project, and continues stewardship while the data is still in use. The primary researcher is allowed to retain a copy of the data, but it is ultimately university-owned. She provides references to other models of data storage, including Zotero and Google applications, which may be worth looking into.
 - Young notes that currently there are no business-level agreements for Research Data archival at UW, and no funding or grants for long-term storage of data. This is increasingly important, as a recent NIH public-access policy affects any public-funded research data, which must be made available to the public, according to SOX (Sarbanes-Oxley). Young states that the issues of greatest interest to FCET (and UW) should be: what is the current policy for data back-up, and is there centralized formatting of the data?
 - Kaminsky thanks Young for her time and attentiveness to this topic, and agrees that having no data retention policy is a problem. He also notes that, within Research, there is an expectation, but no documented policy, for students to turn in log-book at end of career, and issues surround the need to make data available to those appropriate, but while also keeping that data safe. Kaminsky sees value in the topic and a responsibility to follow through with this subject, at least to initiate a process of policy, and polls the committee for their support of this topic, as well. Kaminsky sees an opportunity for FCET to create a definition of Data Archival, as well as a set of guidelines for data archival and warehousing, and retention schedules of that data, by looking at the Stanford model, and noting various guidelines based on subjects, etc.
 - Deshazo notes that Health Sciences is also currently reviewing privacy and intellectual property issues surrounding this topic. Kaminsky will contact the Faculty Council on Research, as well as the Office of Technology Transfer to further discuss this issue.

6. **Old Business** - None

7. **News for Catalyst & Libraries** - None

8. **New Business** - None

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m. *Minutes by Alyssa Robbins, Administrative Assistant, Computing & Communications.*

Present: **Faculty members:** Andrews, Efthimiadis, Hollmann, Kaminsky, Martin-Morris
President's Designee: Moy
ASUW Representative: Schmidt
Ex-officio members: Deshazo, Minton, Young
Guests: Hopkins

Absent: **Faculty members:** Conroy, Masuda
Ex-officio members: Maring
Guests: Lane, Lewis